DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 026 SP 005 228

AUTHOR Fleming, Theodore B., Jr.

TITLE The Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs. CONPASS: From Its Origins to June 30, 1971.

INSTITUTION Consortium of Professional Associations.

PUB DATE 30 Jun 71

NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; *Professional Associations; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This document outlines the history and major activities of the Consortium since its origin in May 1966. It began as a grouping of five discipline-oriented associations concerned with conducting and evaluating Office of Education-funded teacher institutes in specific subject fields. The Consortium has since expanded to a membership of 13 professional associations and is involved in all aspects of teacher preparation. The most noteworthy event in the Consortium's history was the "Grove Park Institute" held near Asheville, North Carolina on June 10-15, 1969. This institute generated 11 position reports, 4 resolutions, and 14 proposals, 11 of which were funded by USOE. Although the Consortium lost its USOE support in May 1971, it will continue on an ad hoc basis to coordinate the action projects which resulted from the Grove Park Institute. (The report includes a list of Consortium board members and an annotated bibliography of Consortium publications.) (RT)

ED055026

CONPASS: FROM ITS ORIGINS TO JUNE 30, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONPASS

400 A Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

June 30, 1971

SP005228

CONPASS: FROM ITS ORIGINS TO JUNE 30, 1971

Theodore B. Fleming, Jr., Wayne State University

The setting out of which CONPASS emerged was the development of concern by the United States Office of Education for the teaching of subject matter and concern by the academic professions in the teaching process. There was a recognition on both sides that a symbiotic relationship could become mutually profitable: the Office wanted the help of the professions and the academic professions felt they should be involved in the evaluation of programs in their areas of expertise.* COMPASS is an acronym for Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs. The original title was more cumbersome, if possible: Consortium of Professional Associations to Supervise Studies of Special Programs for the Improvement of Instruction in American Education. An organization with so pretentious a title as either of the two surely will not be ignored by lexicographers of acronyms; hopefully it will make a sufficient imprint on American education to be recognized for its accomplishments.

The immediate origins of CONPASS go back to the summer of 1965 when five professional associations launched individual evaluations of the first new round of NDEA Institutes; these new institutes were formed under the amendment to the National Defense Education Act which took the original act

* There is no easy term to use in place of "academic professions" or "academic disciplines". Some of the professions are more pedagogical or technological in their orientation than they are academic, as, for example, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Association for Educational Communications Technology. All are involved in the educational enterprise, and here they will be referred to collectively as "professions" or "disciplines"

beyond the foreign language design; the five associations were the Association of American Geographers, the American Historical Association, the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction, the International Reading Association and the Modern Language Association. The objectives of these organizations, which later banded together to form CONPASS, were not only quite narrow in the beginning but they were also self-seeking and cost-efficient. They were self-seeking in the sense that these associations had already become conscious of the pressures that were building up in USOE and in Congress to see that evaluation of new programs take place, and they felt that they rather than outsiders were best qualified to evaluate their institutes, not so much for fear of what the outsiders might or might not say but because after all they were the subject-matter people who were responsible for engineering the institutes. It is in this sense that collaboration with USOE was a kind of self-defense mechanism: the associations said that not only would they help USOE by listing their members who could be of assistance and by encouraging the organizing of institutes but also they would assume the responsibility for evaluating the institutes to see if they were indeed achieving the goal of the Act - - production of teachers who were qualified in their subject. The historians, for example, said: "We know what good history is and therefore we are the ones who are competent to evaluate institutes in our area."

The cost-efficiency aspect was in a way thrust upon the associations by USOE, which believed that there must be some things which these five areas all had in common, either as a technique for evaluation or because there is more to an institute than simply the specific subject matter of the field. The first question of this kind was triggered by the fact that the Bureau of the Budget was responsible for reviewing every questionnaire of any kind

from a research project in the federal government. The Bureau had reviewed a series of questionnaires which the historians had submitted as a part of their evaluation and were quite critical of them, charging, for example, that there were too many questions, that many had been asked before, and so on. USOE quite naturally did not want other associations to run into a similar difficulties, and while they started by contacting the geographers, the questions USOE asked quickly moved beyond the scope of problems particular to the geographers: "Was it not best for all five associations to get together and find out what they were asking and to see what kind of commonalities there were?" "How many psychometricians could be found who could work with the disciplines?" "Was it not possible that each group might be able to use evaluators interchangeably?" In short, USOE believed evaluations could be made less costly and more efficient by some collective effort.

The next step in the creation of CONPASS occurred when suddenly the NDEA legislation was expanded to include additional disciplines. During the summer of 1965 when that legislation was already being considered, the USOE people foresaw that the questions they had been asking the geographers would likely have an even wider applicability: trying to coordinate the efforts of five associations was one thing, but the possibility of programs in twelve or more discipline areas was something else. So here was another pressure: the expansion of the NDEA, already in the wind in 1965, urged USOE people forward in terms of trying to get the five involved disciplines to think of creating a consortium. As a consequence, in the fall of 1965, at a conference attended also by representatives of USOE, the five associations in a sense became the five signatories to the treaty which agreed to bring them together in a loose organization:

> In January 1966, these five associations proposed to USOE the establishment of a cooperative evaluation program under a coordinating body outside USOE. The responsibility of the body would be to develop a unified assessment of the dynamic role of teaching in the schools, the preparation of new teachers, and other educational problems. It was further decided that the program should be assessed, not the individual institutes. Moreover, the assessment effort should be on a long term basis for continuity of analysis in depth and for comparability. It should have flexibility to consider features or needs unique to each discipline while unifying information common to all in broadly based profiles for study and research.*

Encouraged by the reaction in USOE (which was providing funds for these formative meetings, the associations called another meeting in February; there the framework of a Consortium was developed and the Association of American Geographers was chosen to administer its affairs.** The general outlines of a formal proposal for the creation of the Consortium were agreed upon and the proposal was then drawn up and submitted to USOE. Finally in May the proposal was funded for 14 months and the Consortium came into being.

As had been expected, the National Defense Education Act was amended late in 1965, bringing other disciplines into the Title XI program; and subsequently the Consortium was joined by the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association. To establish its policy and review its evaluation of USOE programs the Consortium organized a Board of Directors composed of two representatives of each member association and certain individual members

* CONPASS NEWS, Number 1, September 1967, p. 1.

** No proper names are being used in this narrative report. The number of dedicated professionals of great stature in their own disciplines (as well as in USOE) is so lengthy that it is very likely that many of those who made significant contributions to CONPASS would unfairly be overlooked.

selected to represent such interdisciplinary organizations as the American Council of Learned Societies or to represent the community of scholars with special competence in educational evaluation.

The original concern of the Consortium, the evaluation of specific in-sevice teacher-training programs, continued to be its major activity, and a number of reports were reproduced and disseminated by CONPASS.* However, sometime in the early summer of 1966, when the first round of evaluation reports was being completed, it began to dawn upon the Consortium Board that summative evaluation without formative dimensions was apt to be a pretty sterile kind of activity. The Board began to think in terms of what the long range utility of evaluation was to the disciplines concerned. For example, the question of models was discussed: once a discipline had evaluations of institutes, knew what was wrong with them, and had some ideas of how to improve future institutes, it ought to begin thinking about developing exemplary formats. This was an important first step because it began to move the Consortium to a wider range of activities than just evaluation, though evaluation still remained a major activity. Even when the association members had held their early formative meetings in New York and knew they were getting together for the narrow objective of evaluation, they had begun to speculate about the prospects of broader activities in teacher-education to which their cooperative efforts could lead, as well as about other kinds of inter-disciplinary cooperation. The American Council of Learned Societies played an important catalytic part in this latter kind of thinking. It was ACLS that sponsored the first study of the history group and it was at their initiative that the informal meetings of the

* See attached bibliography.

five associations were held in the summer of 1965. But ACLS, which was already sort of a holding corporation, saw its involvement not merely as one concerned with teacher-education but as one which was merely following its traditional goal of bringing groups of professions together - fortuitously, movement toward creation of a consortium was natural to ACLS. That the ACLS originally acted as the sponsor for the history group was probably an historical accident: for technical reasons it was difficult to work immediately with AHA - - time was short, and there were some historians in ACLS who were perfectly willing to use their resources; but the fact that their role stimulated them to carry their thinking beyond only evaluation was to have far-reaching consequences.

> During 1968, attention began to be directed . . . to other important issues: greater recognition on the part of the US Office of Education of the interests and ideas of subject-matter professional associations concerning teacher training and curriculum development for the schools; improved communication between discipline specialists and professional educators and within the academic professions concerning the need for better education in the schools; and a growing realization that long-range improvement of pre-college education can result only through the joint efforts of subject-matter and educational specialists to revamp pre-service training programs for teachers and to develop new curricula. In other words, the Consortium began to move from its immediate goal, evaluation of in-service training programs, toward its more distant and even more important objective, the involvement of disciplinary associations and specialists in a variety of endeavors, cooperatively with educators and with local, state, and federal school officials, designed to provide better teaching and content in the schools.*

It is quite clear that the evolution of the Board in terms of membership composition reflects a gradual realization on the part of the founding members of CONPASS that the problems <u>of the disciplines</u> in teacher

* Letter of John Thompson to Paul Ward, Executive Secretary, American Historical Association, July 18, 1968.

education could not be framed in isolation from teacher education in practice. The original assumption had been that this Consortium should be a Consortium of subject-matter disciplines. Three of the original five members were associations of disciplines dealing with subject matter; and the other two - - they could be called "quasi-subject-matter disciplines" - - were invited partly because they were included directly in the Act of Congress but basically because their participation was convenient. There was not very much of an interest within the disciplines in terms of broadening the Board so that there would be an equal input by the pedagogical elements; the Board took the position that there should be one place where the non-pedagogical subject-matter disciplines should put their house in order and then find a means for talking to the pedagogical organizations. For example, the early stages of the development of CONPASS, the feeling was that organizations like the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Social Studies, and so on, should not be member organizations. But it was recognized that the Consortium needed the input of these kinds of people, and leading members of these organizations were made part of the Consortium Board on an individual basis. About 1967 it became evident to the Board members that pedagogical and non-pedagogical input had to be considered in parity terms. They began to realize that while these individual members did do the Consortium some good, they could not do nearly as much as individuals as they could if they were representing the power of their organizations. The issue was originally forced when AACTE sent an official letter to USOE saying that they had heard that a Consortium had been formed and asking why they were not in it.

Members of the Consortium early began to express interest in curriculum

but in the beginning the concern of CONPASS with curriculum was almost incidental: it was related directly to whether a member association was deeply involved with curriculum projects or not. Concern with curriculum was due neither to pressures from USOE nor even to interest of USOE, USOE, basically, has looked at curriculum as something different from and separate from teacher training, and it did very little to encourage CONPASS to concern itself with curriculum matters. It is true that the curriculum areas in USOE are not in the teacher training branch but in the Bureau of Research; but nonetheless, even when CONPASS received support, as it did, from the Bureau of Research, it was not for evaluating the curriculum projects which the Bureau had supported - - it was simply to help CONPASS in evaluating teacher training models. This may reflect a kind of bias in USOE.

The reverse has been true in the National Science Foundation, which has shown minimal interest in teacher training but obviously a great deal of interest in curriculum, first in the sciences and then in the social sciences. Starting in 1967 CONPASS began to invite representatives of the National Science Foundation to some of its meetings, people who were involved in their school curriculum projects. CONPASS continued to invite them on a sort of sporadic basis, the assumption being that sooner or later CONPASS wanted to get into evaluating curriculum, though not in terms of evaluating curriculum per se so much as in terms of finding some over-all evaluative model that would encompass a blend of teacher-training processes and curriculum. At one point, about 1967, NSF asked CONPASS to develop a history of the diffusion process of their curricula. NSF was not interested in having CONPASS evaluate whether the biology project, for example, was a good project from the curriculum standpoint, but they were interested in

having CONPASS evaluate the process of dissemination of curriculum innovation: by what kinds of schools were their curricula adopted, how rapidly were their programs adopted, was the adoption of the biology curriculum in a given system a prerequisite to the adoption of science curriculum, and so on? This common interest was pursued and NSF had just about given CONPASS the signal to go ahead; but CONPASS could not find the historians of science they needed, and then after a four or five month period there were changes in NSF structure, and interest in that particular project was lost. In 1967, nevertheless, there was a deliberate desire both by CONPASS and by NSF to find a project, almost any project, which could create a relationship between the two organizations. All of this strengthened the motives among CONPASS members to enter curriculum evaluation, for until that was done no complete picture of teacher-education improvement could emerge.

In the fall of 1968 CONPASS began planning for a conference that would provide a springboard enabling it to move beyond the evaluation effort that continued to be its major function. By then it had become quite clear that some such effort was necessary if the Consortium was to get on with what most of the Board considered to be the central issues of concern: Curriculum and Materials, Teaching Strategies, and the Teacher.

At the October 1968 meeting of the Consortium Board, the Chairman announced that the Board was finally going to try to get off "the plateau of evaluation"; following that meeting a planning committee was formed to prepare for a large-scale conference to take place about June 1969.

In a letter of December 9, 1968 the Chairman sent out a charge to the associations; this letter not only gave the Planning Committee some guidelines but eventually provided invited participants a notion of what they would be considering. As the Chairman pointed out, the charge was indeed

vague and ambiguous and was meant to be so, but it can be said that it still captures the flavor of what had been in the minds of so many members of the CONPASS Board and had been discussed informally over such a long period of time. Among the propositions included in the letter of December 9th were the following:

a) For various periods (three to four years in most cases), many of the scholarly disciplines have been seeking to translate their content and spirit in a fashion that will have pedagogical worth to both school and college. Various mechanisms - - summer institutes, year-round fellowship programs, curriculum packages - - have been utilized. CONPASS, and preceding the establishment of CONPASS, the individual disciplines, have been evaluating some of these mechanisms. It is time for the disciplines represented in CONPASS to review the results of these various evaluation studies.

b) CONPASS operates through its constituent organizations. CONPASS delegates have few opportunities to discuss issues frankly within their organizations. It is time for CONPASS delegates to convene several leading members of their societies who are, or should be, concerned with the educational enterprise. What is needed is a greater sense of involvement on the part of the leadership of the discipline.

c) CONPASS is concerned with more than merely evaluating existing models - - it should stimulate the creation of new models for teacher-training in the separate and grouped disciplines. It is time to solicit ideas from a wide variety of individuals as to what kinds of new models would be worth testing.

d) Last year's EPDA legislation (i.e., 1968) and more recent decisions on budgetary allotments have raised some doubts in scholarly circles as to whether the USOE continues to be committed to encouraging teacher training ventures in the disciplines. It is time to dispel doubts about the commitment of USOE to encouraging teacher training ventures in the disciplines, or to articulate the new position of USOE if there is indeed a philosophically different position that seeks to downgrade the role of the disciplines.

e) A considerable number of individuals and institutions who rallied to various NDEA and HEA projects seem to be backing away now. Is this simply "combat fatigue"? Is it disillusion with what has gone on? Or is it merely loss of momentum stemming from relaxation of efforts by the scholarly associations? It is time to inventory the involvement trends on the part of institutions and disciplines in the various USOE, NSF, and foundation-supported teacher and curriculum development programs.

I urge you to consider the issues at two scales - - the disciplinary and the multi-disciplinary.

There are many who say that the disciplines are incapable of directing the necessary changes in American education. Perhaps they are right. But if they are right, then they are predicting chaos and doom. For without the traditions, the substance and the central role that disciplines must play in the educational enterprise, there will be no educational enterprise.*

The Conference Planning Committee met periodically from just before Christmas 1968, until the Conference met, June 10 - 15, at the Grove Park

* Letter of Saul Cohen, Chairman of the CONPASS Board.

Inn near Asheville, North Carolina. The broad purpose of the conference is encapsulated in the title that it was finally given: "The Disciplines in the Continuum of Teacher Education", but the purpose of the conference is best described at some greater length in the Board Chairman's opening remarks at the conference:

> The purpose of this conference is to reassess the nature and extent of the commitment of scholarly disciplines to the teacher enterprise. To date, most of this commitment has been expressed through the actions of small, often isolated, numbers of individuals, operating within the confines of their scholarly disciplines. There has been little organized cross - or multi-disciplinary activity at least at the initiative level of the national academic association.
>
> To reassess our commitment we're going to have to think through a variety of educational, social and even political issues. We can no longer ask such narrow questions as: "How can professional historians see to it that better history is taught in the schools and colleges?" or "How can better-trained biologists be induced to enter teaching ranks, given adequate curricular materials?" For these are ego-centric questions. They fail to grapple with such central issues as the purpose of the educational enterprise and society, and specific responsibilities that professional scholardom has to the university in whose milieu, scholardom either must thrive or languish. I would like to touch upon three aspects of this problem.

First, he added, our commitment demands a fundamental change in attitude towards the functional role of American schools and colleges. We have tried a number of models in attempting to cope with the problems educational institutions face in accomplishing their goals. We have tried the "trickle-down theory" and parceled out "research pearls" to the colleges and schools. We have also tried to remold the teacher in the image of the scholar by intensive training experiences in the manner of the famous summer institutes. Still another model by which we have attempted to achieve some of our goals, though unsuccessfully, is the "teacher-proof, instant

curriculum pattern . . . to salvation".

The second perspective from which the conferees were asked to consider the issues confronting them was the one of relevance. While readily admitting that relevance had not only become a trite concept but that it was also a complex one with many dimensions, he emphasized that whatever else it implied, relevance did mean that the disciplines must consider a variety of populations and their particular needs.

Thirdly, he stressed that the commitment of the disciplines could not be made without a direct response to the challenge of the university crises, and while the crises, like relevance, were complex matters with many dimensions to them, underlying the crises in the universities was certainly one major difficulty: "good teaching is everyone's business in the university -- the classroom is no sanctuary for the whims of arbitrary instructors or of irresponsible students."

It is impossible even to attempt to canvass the kinds of activities that went on during those five days at Grove Park. There were plenary sessions at which the conferees heard the pertinent and trenchant remarks of such speakers as Kenneth Boulding, Bentley Glass, Paul Sharp, Don Bigelow, Paul Olson, and others. Much of the remaining time each day was spent by small groups made up of the members of the various associations. For example, the eight representatives of the American Political Science Association met six or seven times, discussing what they might be able to do or the Association might be able to do to spread the involvement of its members in teacher-education and curriculum reform and in like matters. These sessions did not only occur at scheduled times but often went on well into the night on an informal basis. This experience was repeated among

the conferees of the other associations. And then another interesting phenomenon began to develop: members of the various disciplines found that they had mutual interests - - sometimes they were of a typical inter-disciplinary nature, but at other times these interests were novel. Ad hoc groups of this sort began to hold sessions and some of them concluded the week with their own special reports.

The conference did conclude with reports from not only the special emergent groupings but also from the planned association sections. Most of these reports have been published in one place or another, most usually in the journal of the association or its "News and Notes". A full-scale account of the entire conference, including the remarks of the speakers, distillations of the discussions of the smaller sessions, and the final reports of the participatory groups was assembled by a general editor. He introduces his report by saying "on the relationship between recognizing failure and quality":

> Teachers, like golfers, miss a humiliating percentage of their shots. Any superiority they gain on their tour comes to consist mainly in learning how to handle that chronic imperfection which is the first condition of their trade. They rarely rid themselves of it. When and if they do, they are forced to recognize in this very absence of strain and frustration their failure in self-criticism, a fundamental lowering of their standards. Their offenses against art, or scholarship, or research, are flagrant. Each of the disciplines imposes an ideal of the fully seen, or felt, or organized - - no essential part missing, no unintentional boinging, buzzing confusion. To ask anyone to accept such contradictory assumptions beneath his

labor is to expect much, and conceivably get little - - or even less.*

The Conference itself took some big steps toward facing up to the stresses lying between the professional disciplines and teaching. Whether it set in motion a rippling out of involvement of academics in teaching or merely capitalized on an undercurrent of involvement already present can never be determined; but what does it matter: the effect is there.

At the end of the conference it was announced that CONPASS was prepared to negotiate with USOE for funds that would allow each of the disciplines, and some inter-disciplinary groups, to pursue some of the lines of thinking that had developed during the conference. The notion behind this effort was to arrange for planning grants for future conferences limited to the participating associations, but which would carry on the beginnings of the work developed at Grove Park. A number of the associations received grants of $4,000 for a beginning in this direction. The way in which the original small grant was used varied considerably from association to association: some of them clearly were for planning purposes for larger conferences designed to stimulate still further interchange among interested members of that particular association. Other patterns of the use of these early grants include one in particular: namely, the bringing together of particularly selected "change agents" in the academic professions. For example, it was decided that many department chairmen throughout the country meet any possible definition of change agent. One of the major obstacles to the involvement of academicians in teacher preparation and curriculum planning has been the absence of professional rewards for that kind of activity except for those in colleges of education. The feeling was that chairmen

* Tom Vogt, "Introduction", Five levels of Incompetence: Higher Education, Teaching, and the Education of Teachers (CONPASS, 1970).

of departments might take some steps that would begin to change this general atmosphere that is endemic in academia. What effect the conferences of department chairmen may have in the long run is questionable at this point in history. Whatever their effect, the effort was a well calculated and much belated one.

Following the small-size, short-range projects which came shortly after the Grove Park Conference, a number of more ambitious projects were undertaken. The flavor of the kind of thing that followed from the Grove Park impetus can best be seen in the following brief summary of some of these projects:

The American Anthropological Association undertook to construct a diversified teacher-training program which would have as its primary objective the generation of new techniques of teaching anthropology to teachers of children in the 6th and 7th grades. This involved the introduction of a course titled Man: A Course of Study. The American Association of Colleges for Teachers of Education sponsored a project that was interdisciplinary in nature. The goal of this project was to design an experimental elementary teacher-training program that would prepare intermediate or upper-grade elementary school teachers of the social-behavioral sciences. Those charged with the implementation of this program are trying to develop interdisciplinary curriculum materials and to communicate them to the teachers who can put them to use in the elementary grades. The American Psychological Association sponsored a project that had the original goals and objectives of preparing guidelines for the teaching of psychology in the secondary school, of preparing guidelines for the preparation and certification of teachers, and of surveying existing materials for use in teaching psychology in the secondary schools. While they had to modify the first

two objectives of their program because of their ambitious nature and the time and money available, the third goal was met by a final report, a source book for high school teachers of psychology. The Association of American Geographers undertook a series of conferences to upgrade the teaching of elementary and secondary school geography programs. At these conferences, teachers of the introductory college course of geography spent some time in the demonstration of activities in innovative teaching by geographers. The philosophy behind this program was that most elementary and secondary school geography teachers have little academic work in geography beyond the introductory college course, and therefore if the instruction of the introductory course at the college level can be brought up to date in terms of both materials offered and teaching techniques, then the students of those courses who go out to teach geography will be better prepared to teach the elementary and secondary school students. Out of the interchange of a number of representatives of different social science disciplines at the Grove Park Conference there was developed a project entitled "Interdisciplinary Urban Problems Course for Training Social Studies Teachers". A Course Development Group consisting of a geographer, sociologist, historian, economist, and political scientist was organized and began to establish a project designed to strengthen the training of social studies teachers by the inclusion of an integrated course in social sciences at the senior college level for pre-service teachers. Through the sponsorship of the International Reading Association four programs with similar goals were established to improve the students' achievement in reading in the substantive areas of English, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Science; these projects were designed with the goals of disseminating knowledge about methods and materials for teaching reading within various disciplines in secondary

schools, and of bringing about greater cooperation among personnel in liberal arts, colleges of education, and public schools. The Association of Departments of English of the Modern Language Association established a program of a series of seminars in different regions of the country, seminars attended not only by chairmen of Departments of English but also by chairmen of other disciplines such as history, political science, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, and geography. These seminars were designed as training programs to bring the professional associations into an active role in the training of administrators at the department level and they have been successful in producing a cadre of English Department chairmen who have become knowledgeable about the problems and possibilities in teacher education and who are committed to a reordering of priorities within their own disciplines. The program of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages of the Modern Language Association was to present a model teacher preparation program for the education of teachers so that they might become accredited in ESOL and Bilingual Education. Their whole program was designed to improve and accelerate the attempt to provide minority groups with the command of English that is so especially necessary in acquiring the education equal to those for whom English is their first language.

This summary of the post-Grove Park programs is totally inadequate to demonstrate the breadth and range of objectives for which they were designed. Summary reports of the project activities have been accumulated by CONPASS and submitted to USOE, reports which elaborate on their activities and give evaluations of how well they have achieved their goals. The amount of money allotted to each of the programs varied but the average was in the range of $50,000.

The American Political Science Association has an ambitious project based at Indiana University which, though not funded directly through CONPASS, was triggered by the Grove Park Conference. This project is dedicated to the goal of providing the profession with the potential of its relationship with elementary and secondary education and is a part of the thrust of the Association's Pre-collegiate Committee effort; it is attempting to develop and implement long-range strategy for more effectively mobilizing the profession in educational research, development, and service activities at the pre-collegiate level.

From the above it can be seen that the efforts of CONPASS, particularly as set in motion by the impetus of the Grove Park Conference have begun to have some impact on American education, or at least have that potential.

In September 1970, CONPASS took a further step in the broadening of its activities and proposed "that the resources of the organized disciplines be concentrated on teaching and teacher education, on a par with emphasis on research." On the premise that the professional associations were the best agencies for mobilizing the resources of the traditional disciplines and that CONPASS was an existing consortium of these organizations, a formal proposal was presented to USOE to convert CONPASS to a major educational institution with the central role of "leading the disciplines into teacher training." The thought was that CONPASS would then have a more stable existence and perform at the same hierarchical level as such other "discipline-based consortia as the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science."*

* CONPASS Proposal, September 1970, "The Disciplines in Teaching".

This proposal gave explicit recognition to the rapid movement of the professional associations toward organized involvement in teaching and teacher education; it was designed to give added stimulus to this trend, to provide a central agency through which the associations could accelerate these activities by mutual support, and to bring into existence a major agent for changing the prevailing attitudes in academia toward teaching at any level: to bring it greater respectability.

The Office of Education did not accept the proposal. Many USOE spokesmen, however, do strongly express their belief that the disciplines have an important place in the promotion of teaching and teacher education. Despite their protestations there has been prolonged backing and filling. There have been a succession of designs for studying how the disciplines can come together and augment their impact on USOE concerns. At this writing (June 1971) none of these plans has apparently arrived at the point of organizing any actual study of the problem.

On May 13, 1971, the CONPASS Board ratified the decision to go "underground", or perhaps more accurately stated, to continue its activities as a consortium on an ad hoc basis, despite withdrawal of support by USOE. The decision was made to close the central office on June 30 and the Executive Director was charged with the preparation of a final report, to include a full set of all published materials, a fiscal report, this history of CONPASS, and a letter of transmittal.

The action projects that have been described are on-going programs. Their directors have already met together at least once and will probably find it mutually profitable to meet again on other occasions. These projects represent activities of a fairly representative number of the professions in CONPASS and can provide a nucleus for continuing discussions

of CONPASS concerns. By resolution at the May meeting the Board decided that as occasion warranted, "not less than one representative of the professions in CONPASS should join these projects directors not only for the transaction of business of concern to the future of these projects but also to consider the wider concerns of CONPASS, concerns in which it was involved and for which it was making plans when its support by the Office of Education was terminated. "Support of those who might represent the professions was never to be a burden on the funds of the on-going projects - - these additional funds were to be sought elsewhere, whether by subsidy of the professions, or supplemental funds from the Office of Education, or in some cases from the personal contributions of the members of the disciplines.

In the judgment of the Board, whether or not CONPASS goes out of existence there are enough matters of mutual profit to the professions that some kind of organization will evolve, whatever format it may take. One need only look at the number of associations that have in their central offices "bureaus of education" or "teaching commissions" to recognize that the professions and their members are becoming increasingly enmeshed, whether it be only a concern or a deep involvement, in the teaching of their subjects.

The enterprise of the educationists and the academic disciplines are not separable, and all associations, whether they be of the order of AACTE or NCTE, or AHA, or APSA, have contributions to share with each other, mutually beneficial programs to plan, and symbiotic relationships to exploit.

The tragedy of timing is that USOE's termination of support of CONPASS

coincided with the emergence of CONPASS from the business of evaluation of Office of Education programs into a much wider involvement of the academic professions in all facets of teaching, and at all levels. It is just not credible that the concerned administrators in the Office of Education did not believe that the academic professions and their associations had no significant input to make to teacher education. Yet the proposal of CONPASS was turned down at the very point when CONPASS was about to evolve into a major educational institution, an agent of the associations that could give them help both individually and collectively in the augmentation of their input to teaching and teacher education.

A most recent turn, and one whose direction is not fully discerned, has been the granting of modest support by the USOE to the ad hoc consortium of professional associations for the coordination of the Grove Park Action Projects during the coming year. Efforts have also been renewed by the US Office to establish an advisory committee that will, among its other functions, be concerned with articulating programs that can be supportive of the disciplines within the US Office's overall programmatic responsibilities. This hopeful turn of events suggests that the final pages of the history of CONPASS have yet to be written; what has been presented in this paper, then, may represent the first chapter of a significant event in the history of American education - the involvement of the organized disciplines in the teaching process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Axelrod, Joseph, The Education of the Modern Foreign Language Teacher for American Schools: Analysis of Ends and Means for Teacher-Preparation Programs in Modern Foreign Languages Based on a Study of NDEA Foreign Language Institutes, The Modern Language Association of America, 1966, (with Appendices), 55 pp.

This report deals with redefining the ends of the instruction offered by language departments and discovering more adequate curricular to implement those ends. Contained are a sketch of the successful foreign language teacher in the American school and recommendations for curricular development in teacher-education programs (based on study groups of NDEA Foreign Language Institutes). The final section deals with the need for professional organizations to help in this task of curricular reform. A number of concrete suggestions are made. Appendices: 1) Members of the 1965 Institute Study Project, 2) MLA Guidelines for Teacher-Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages.

From Undergraduate Student to Professional Teacher: An Assessment of NDEA Institutes for Undergraduates Preparing to Become Elementary or Secondary Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, 1967, (with Tables, Appendices), 66 pp.

This study was conducted in the summers of 1965 and 1966 to determine the effectiveness of institutes as a supplement to college language programs. Information sources for the study were institute directors and their staff, visitors' observations, and questionnaires. A summary of the questionnaire data is presented under the headings Language Skills, Foreign Culture, Linguistics, and Methodology. The data and their implications are assessed. A sample of the questionnaire, detailed response data, and 22 pages of free comments from the respondents are included in the appendices.

Brown, Donald J., and Brown, James W., Evaluations of Summer 1966 NDEA Institutes for Educational Media Specialists and School Library Personnel, Educational Media Institute Evaluation Project, San Jose, California, and the Department of Audio-visual Instruction (National Education Association), 1966, (with Appendices), 109 pp.

The purpose of this evaluation was to gather data from 35 Education Media Specialist Institutes on (1) personal and professional characteristics of institute participants, (2) characteristics of the institutes themselves, (3) the effectiveness of institute programs, (4) the effectiveness of institute experiences on participant interests and skills, and (5) on-the-job influences of institute experiences.

Data were gathered by personal information report forms, on-site visitors' reports, and original proposals and final reports of institute directors. The institutes are described as basic, advanced, television, special, or librarianship. Reports are given of data findings at each type of institute.

Effects of Special Media Institute Programs Upon the Behavior of Title XI NDEA Institute Directors (English, History, Geography, Reading, Modern Foreign Languages, and School Library Personnel), Department of Audio-visual Instruction (National Education Association) for CONPASS, 1966, (with Tables, Appendices), 72 pp.

Data used in assessing the scope and quality of attention paid to "new instruction materials" in the 1965 NDEA Institutes were gathered from site visits (4 in each of the 6 fields) and from questionnaires sent to institute directors. Findings: (1) the quality and frequency of attention to new materials varied considerably, but was generally far below the expected potential, (2) directors seemed to not be aware of the scope and availability of new materials applicable to elementary and secondary schools. Recommendation: a series of special institutes be developed to appraise future directors of appropriate ways of utilizing educational media.

*Cate, James Lea, The 1965 History Institutes Revisited, American Council of Learned Societies, 1966, 46 pp.

This follow-up survey was conducted to check some of the findings of the first survey of the 1965 History Institutes, but primarily to see whether and how the institutes improved the teaching of history in the schools. Data were gathered from mail questionnaires and in-depth interviews with 42 participants. The evaluators conclude that the institutes did much to improve teaching in high schools, but many failed to provide useful guidance in the transfer and translation of material to the classroom.

*Cohen, Saul B., Final Report of the NDEA Geography Institutes Evaluation Program, 1965 Summer Institutes, Association of American Geographers and the National Council for Geographic Education, November, 1965, 40 pp.

This study was conducted because of the pressing need to identify, evaluate and clarify such problems as objectives, curriculum content and integration, participant selection, staff structure, and translation of materials to the classroom. The evaluation focussed on the effectiveness (1) with which the institute as total commitment was carried out, (2) of instructors and supervisors, (3) of geographical concepts presented, and (4) the degree to which new materials and materials to facilitate "transfer and translation" to the classroom were introduced.

26

Crockett, Walter H., Bentley, Joseph C., and Laird, James D., Report on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1966-1967, (with Appendices), 1967, 107 pp.

The objective of the ExTFP program is to improve the quality of education in American elementary and secondary schools - (1) by assisting potentially influential teachers to pursue full-time graduate education in specially planned courses of study, and (2) by fostering an increased concern for the training of teachers. This report describes in detail a preliminary study of the first year of the program based on (1) reports by experienced evaluators and (2) responses to questionnaires administered to staff and participants.

Teachers as Students: Report on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1967-1968, 1970, 131 pp.

This report represents the second in a series of three investigations conducted each year of the ExTFP programs. Data were gathered from in-depth investigations of three institutions, a questionnaire administered to all fellows and faculty at all institutions with ExTFP programs, and a questionnaire sent to 67 fellows inquiring about post-fellowship experience. The results of the study are summarized and implications for teacher training and for higher education in general assessed.

*Gray, Donald J., The 1965 Institutes in English: Report of a Pilot Study to Develop Criteria for Evaluating NDEA Institutes in English, The Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, April, 1966, (with Appendices), 102 pp.

The dual purposes of this 1965 pilot study were to draw conclusions about how a study of institutes could best be conducted and to report on what the institutes accomplished. The primary data were collected through questionnaires sent to participants and staffs and scattered site visits. It was concluded that future studies should not attempt to judge institutes, but rather to describe them, communicating to non-participant teachers what is new and effective in the institutes and the teaching of English.

Report on the Arts and Humanities Institutes of 1966, 1966, (with Tables), 27 pp.

This report was based in part on visitation reports by Grose Evans, Curator, Extension Services, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.; John F. Latimer, Classics Department, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; John F. Morrison, Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; and Lee Rigsby, Director, School of Music, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Eleven institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers (three music, two art, two theater, two humanities, one Latin,

and one film) were evaluated on the basis of questionnaire responses from 300 of the 430 participants, final reports of institute directors, and detailed reports of observers. The greater emphasis on subject content than on instructional methodology in these institutes was approved by most participants. It was recommended that institutes be continued and that single-subject, explicitly innovative institutes be given preference.

The Lessons of Summer Institutes, April, 1970, 27 pp.

This report represents an overview of a wide variety of NDEA institute evaluation reports in an attempt to assess the results in the broadest possible terms. The author lays out the common pattern and purposes of the institutes and then discusses which have promise and where the most interesting difficulties lie. Lessons to be drawn from the institutes are outlined.

Hackett, F. D., Schad, J. A., and Stake, R. E., Report on the Summer 1966 Industrial Arts Institutes, 1966, (with Tables), 17 pp.

This study was conducted to collect information for planning future institutes. A committee member visited each institute interviewing the director and participants and a questionnaire was completed by the participants at the end of the institute. Some of the resulting 31 recommendations were (1) directors should weigh the advantages and disadvantages of assuming teaching, (2) some form of weekly evaluation should be conducted, (3) guest speakers should be familiar with the objectives of the institute, and (4) instruction should reflect the latest and best in educational theory.

Hastings, J. Thomas, An Evaluation of the Reading - Review - Award Process Employed in Rating and Recommending EDP Proposals, 1968, (with Appendices), 76 pp.

This professional evaluation of USOE-Bureau of Educational Personnel Development procedures used in reviewing proposals was conducted in July 1968 in an attempt to gather data which could help BEPD in (1) altering its procedures for 1969 and (2) replying to questions from the professional community and from Congress in regard to the validity and efficiency of the procedures used. It also served as preparation for a more extensive evaluation in 1969.

Hastings, J. Thomas, Grotelueschen, Arden, and Sjogren, Douglas D., Aperiodic Report, No. 1, TTT Evaluation Progress Report, December 1969, (with Appendices), 30 pp.

This is the first of a series of reports issued at irregular intervals to communicate the plans, progress, and findings of the

28

evaluation of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program. The first 13 pages of the report outline the activities carried-out to date: (1) visits to cluster meetings and individual projects; (2) staff meetings to discuss the information collected during visits; (3) the preliminary development of interview schedules, questionnaires, and observational techniques. The remainder of the report contains the data-gathering devices that have been developed.

Aperiodic Report, No. 2, Evaluating the 1969 LTI-TTT Site Visitation Procedure, June, 1970, (with Appendices), 38 pp.

This report attempts to describe the history of the total Leadership Training Institute - Trainers of Teacher Trainers (LTI-TTT) site visitation procedure, including how it affected various groups and how these groups reacted to it. The report begins by discussing the evaluator's concept of evaluation and proceeds to describe the background conditions, activities, and outcomes of site visitation, both as they were intended by visitation planners and as they actually occurred. Appendices contain samples of evaluation materials with data on each.

Aperiodic Report, No. 3, The National TTT Program: Noteworthy Activities and Outcomes, October, 1970, (with Appendices), 56 pp.

A description of the National TTT Program based on project directors' assessments of various project components. The summarized informati n is intended to be of use to groups (Bureau of Educational Personnel Development - TTT Branch - USOE) in describing, justifying and planning for future TTT programs. The "structured telephone interview" was used to collect information. Concrete suggestions for program improvement are outlined.

Aperiodic Report, No. 4, An Evaluation of Clustering in TTT, December, 1970, (with Appendices), 39 pp.

The rationale behind this evaluation of the clustering activities of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program for 1969-1970 was to provide continuous, systematic feedback of information to relevant groups on which to base sound judgments leading to program improvement. Contained in the report is specific information about the means and outcomes of clustering, and about the organization of clusters and the extent of parity in TTT. Sources of data include observations of meetings by evaluators, questionnaire responses, and interviews with project directors.

Hook, J. N., NDEA Institutes for Trainers of Teachers, (Summer, 1966), 1966, (with Tables, Appendices), 82 pp.

Approximately two-thirds of the participants in these institutes were college persons with responsibility for preparing teachers

and typically had 10-12 years experience, often on more than one academic level. Instruments of evaluation included questionnaires and structured interviews. Recommendations were for more institutes, average size - 30 participants, careful planning, reasonably heterogeneous groups, early and full involvement of staff, a light teaching load for the director, extensive use of consultants, an active role for participants, and inter-weaving and development of new materials.

Longaker, Richard, and Cleary, Robert, Report on the Evaluation of Pilot Civics Institutes, NDEA 1966, 1966, 7 pp.

While the institutes were judged worthwhile by the authors, deficiencies were found particularly in the transfer and translation of new material to the classroom. Among the proposals for improving the institutes: (1) institutes should be distributed geographically by subject matter, (2) methods should be identified for overcoming the problem of transfer, and (3) continuing institutes should be funded whereby teachers could participate in a second summer institute following a year of classroom application.

Masia, Bertram B., and Mitchell, P. David, Evaluating a National Program: The Training of Teachers of Teachers, Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, (Princeton, Educational Testing Service), 1968, 88 pp.

The authors seek to give a sense of the origins and scope of a national project and a sense of some of the more salient issues facing an evaluation group monitoring and assessing it. As the report was written while the evaluation was in progress, no results are reported here. The evaluation consisted of appraising the performance characteristics of the project design as it was implemented over a 9 month period.

Perloff, Evelyn, Project IMPACT: A Pilot Study Evaluating the NDEA Summer Institute Program, October, 1970, 82 pp.

This document reports research undertaken on a pilot basis during the period 1966-1970 in an effort to provide an evaluation of the impact of the summer institutes program outlined in Title XI of the NDEA of 1958. Evaluation personnel devised a 3-prong attack on the question of effectiveness. Project 1 focussed on participants and staff, assessing their attitudes and opinions concerning institute effectiveness. Project 2 sought to measure pre-to-post institute changes in participants. Project 3 assessed the influence of the institute on the host academic institution. Each component is considered separately.

Planning Grant for Association Activities (to AAAS), Conference on the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of Science, June 29-30, 1970, September, 1970, 80 pp.

The significant aspect of this conference was the bringing together of natural and social scientists and engineers to consider how teaching education programs can prepare science teachers to give more adequate attention to problems of society that have arisen from scientific and technological developments. Two background papers used as advance preparation are included as well as appendices containing the conference agenda and list of participants.

Reese, Jim E., and Darcy, Robert L., Report on the 1966 NDEA Advanced Study Institutes in Economics, 1966, (with Tables, Appendix), 25 pp.

In their report of the 5 economic institutes, the evaluators express the belief that all were successful. Their most general criticism is that the institutes failed to produce anything really new or novel in content or in teaching techniques. These observations are based on data gathered from site visits; interviews with directors, staff and participants; and questionnaires completed by participants at the end of the programs. Other findings are outlined and implications assessed.

Shugrue, Michael F., Barth, Carl A., and Ruth, Leo, An Evaluation of the Use of English Institute Materials Center Curriculum Materials in NDEA Summer Institutes in English, 1966 (with Tables, Appendices), 24 pp.

In reviewing the use and effectiveness of EIMC experimental curriculum units, evaluators visited a cross-section of institutes. Reports on these visits and questionnaires sent to each institute indicated that while EIMC performed a valuable service to the institute, EIMC materials generally were not well used. Conclusion: effectiveness of materials could be improved by adding new units and by systematically introducing curriculum materials to institute directors. In addition, the establishment of centers similar to EIMC by other disciplines should be given serious consideration.

*Thompson, John M. (editor), Teachers, History, and NDEA Institutes, 1965, American Council of Learned Societies, 1965, (with Tables, Appendices), 39 pp.

Assessment was conducted by a survey team of 15 historians and specialists in social studies and educational evaluation. The report stresses the fact that these end-of-summer findings are tentative while the real impact of the institutes will become known in the follow-up report due the spring of 1966. Along with

the fact that there were clear gains in cognition, the team noted the importance of the re-establishment of contact between historians and teachers. Appendices include: List of Team Members, Statistical Tables, and Organization and Procedures of the Survey.

Van Tesslar, A. P., Report on the Joint European - United States NDEA Institutes for Advanced Study, Mannheim - Heidelburg, June 30 - August 24, 1966, 1967, (with Appendices) 19 pp.

Analysis of the institute was conducted with the idea of strengthening the effectiveness of it and similar programs. The commentary (1) examines from the European point of view, the preparation and conduct of the institute, (2) emphasizes specific problems and advantages associated with European participation, and (3) evaluates the present and potential role of such institutes in European education. Described are the genesis of the idea, the preparation of the project, and the structure and organization of the institute. Features of the institute are evaluated with special attention paid to function and duration, age of reference groups, recommended emphases, and supplementary activities.

Vogt, Thomas (editor), Five Levels of Incompetence: Higher Education, Teaching, and the Education of Teachers - The Grove Park Institute, 1970. 309 pp.

* Published prior to the official establishment of CONPASS.